



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IX. — The Genitive and Dative Singular of the Latin Pronominal Declension

BY PROFESSOR EDGAR H. STURTEVANT
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE problem presented by the Latin pronominal genitives in *-ius* and datives in *-i* has frequently been discussed ever since the early days of comparative grammar, and many divergent views have been advanced. References to this literature may be found in Stolz's *Lateinische Grammatik*¹, 223, and Brugmann's *Grundriss*², II, 2, 330. Since the appearance of the latest handbooks portions of the topic have been taken up anew by Solmsen (*KZ.* XLIV, 177), Wackernagel (*IF.* xxxi, 268 ff.), Ehrlich (*Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung*, 72 ff.), and the author (*TAPA*, XLIII, 57 ff., *CP.* VIII, 485 f.).

In view of the many solutions of the riddle which have been proposed only to be rejected by the next writer on the subject it may seem rash to make another attempt. There is, however, hope of success if we consistently adopt a point of view which has already been responsible for the most solid contributions that have been made. Instead of confining our attention to Latin or attempting to trace Latin forms directly to Indo-European, we should first of all make a diligent search for correspondences between Latin and the other Italic dialects. Several of these have been recognized by one scholar or another, but they have not been combined into one system. There is, besides, one point of similarity between Latin and Oscan which hitherto has apparently escaped detection.

Buck, *Vocalismus der oskischen Sprache*, 151 f., identified the possessive adjective *quouis a um* with Oscan *púiu* 'quoia' on the basis of Italic **quouius* from genitive-dative-locative **quoui* and the adjective suffix *-ios* (cf. *ποίος* from **ποι-ιος*). The identification of the adjective *quouis* with Oscan *púiu* has recently been adopted by Sommer (*Handbuch*, 472), Solmsen (*loc.*), Brugmann (*Berichte der sächs. Gesellsch.* LX, 61 ff.,

*Grundriss*², II, 2, 329 f.), and Stolz (*Lateinische Grammatik*⁴, 222 f.), although they differ from Buck's interpretation at various points;¹ in spite of Wackernagel's scepticism (*IF.* xxxi, 270), we may probably consider this one of the established conclusions of the science.

Brugmann makes the further assumption that Latin *eius*, *huius*, *illius*, etc. represent Italic possessive adjectives **eijjos*, **hoijjos*, **illeijjos*; but in support of this he is not able to cite any evidence either of an adjectival use of the forms in Latin or of the existence of cognates in the dialects (see Solmsen, *l.c.*). Furthermore, it is unlikely that in **illeijjos*, etc., *ě* before *ij* would become *ĩ* (a necessary step in the change of **illeijjos* to *illius*), since unaccented *ě* persists before other double consonants, and since *ě* from original *ǣ* persists before *ij* (**Márraijos* > *Mareijus*). It is, therefore, unlikely that primitive Italic had possessive adjectives from the demonstrative stems.

Luchs, Studemund's *Studien*, I, 319 ff., demonstrated that in numerous places where our manuscripts of early Latin authors record *quoinus*, *huius*, *eius*, *illius*, etc., the meter requires a form one syllable shorter. Skutsch, *Phil.* LIX, 495, 500 f., held that the forms in question were *illis*, etc. and these genitives (*illis*, *quois*, *huis*, *eis*, etc.) are now very generally accepted, although nearly all editors of Plautus and Terence retain the manuscript spellings *illius*, *quoinus*, etc. In *Geras*, 125, and *Glotta*, I, 305 f., Skutsch identified the ending of *illis*, *istis*, etc., with that of pronominal genitives in Oscan and Umbrian (e.g. Osc. *els-els* Umbr. *er-er*) on the basis of Italic *-eis*, the regular genitive ending of *i*-stems in Indo-European and Oscan and therefore in Italic. It is equally possible, however, that *-eis* in the pronominal declension was the *o*-stem locative *-ei* + a genitival *s*, as in early Latin, *mī-s*, *tī-s* (cf. Ahlberg, *De correptione iambica Plautina*). Skutsch inferred that the Plautine spelling was *illeis*, but, in view of Ehrlich's

¹ Sommer separates the genitive *quoinus* from the possessive adjective. Brugmann does not derive Greek *ποῖος* from **poi-ios*. Solmsen thought that the base of Italic **quojjos* was the nominative **quoi*. For a reply to Wackernagel's chief difficulty, see below, p. 104.

demonstration (*l.c.*) that unaccented *ei* became *ī* before Plautus' time, it is clear that the latter wrote and pronounced *illīs*, whether we regard this as an *i*-stem or an *o*-stem form.

It has long been recognized that Oscan *altrei*, 'alteri,' contains the same ending as Latin *illī*, etc. Most scholars have considered such forms original locatives, but Skutsch, *Glotta*, I, 305 ff., prefers to consider them datives of the *i*-stems that appear in such adverbs as *illim*. There seems to be no decisive evidence for either of the two possibilities. If the pronominal datives are *o*-stem locatives, the genitives are probably locatives with a genitival *-s* appended. On the other hand, if the datives are *i*-stem forms, the genitival *-eis* is also an *i*-stem ending.² In either case Latin *illīs* and *illī* represent Italic endings *-eis* and *-ei* respectively.

The diphthong of Latin *quois* and *quoi* must be the product of contraction, since original *oi* would become *ū* if accented and *ī* (Plautine *ē*) if unaccented. It is usually assumed that the original form of the dative was **quoīīei*, a form which harmonizes, on the one hand, with the genitive **quoīīos*, and, on the other, with the datives like *illī* from **illei*. For the change of **quoīīei* to **quoīīi* to **quōī* to *quoi*, see *CP.* VIII, 485 and references. The genitive *quois* may in like fashion be traced to an Italic genitive **quoīīeis*, and we have convincing evidence for the existence of this form in the Campanian genitive *pūīieh*, which requires the assumption of an Oscan **pūīieis* (see Buck, *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, 145). Buck's suggestion that **pūīieis* is the genitive singular of the possessive adjective seen in *pūīiu*, 'quoia' (cf. *nostri: noster*) is plausible enough if we confine our attention to Oscan; but no such explanation will hold for an Italic **quoīīeis*, since the genitive of Italic **quoīīos* must have been **quoīīei*. Perhaps **quoīīeis* was a modification of **quoīīei* under the influence of the other pronominal genitives in *-eis*.

The dative **quoīīei*, which we have assumed to account for Latin *quoi*, was probably formed from the genitive **quoīīeis* on the analogy of pairs like **illeis: *illei* (Latin *illis: illi*) and **eiseis: *eisei* (Oscan *eīseis, eīzeis: *eīsei*). That this process

² On this question, compare below, n. 4.

occurred in the Italic period would be reasonably sure if we could point to a dative **pūīiei* in Oscan. No such form has yet been found, but we have a dative of the corresponding *i*-stem which was probably formed from it. The dative *piei* occurs in the *Tabula Bantina*, which is written in the Latin alphabet; if we had the form in the national alphabet it would doubtless be spelled **piiei* (see Buck, *Grammar*, 28, 66). The form seems to have arisen from the analogy: *pūd*: **pūīiei* = *pid*: *pī(i)ei*. Similarly the genitive *pieis(-um)* is most easily derived from the *o*-stem genitive **pūīiets* (Campanian *pūīieh*).³

The extant remnants of Oscan and Umbrian exhibit traces of a separate ending for the genitive feminine; Umbrian has feminine *erar* 'eius' beside masculine *erer*, and Oscan has a feminine *ulas* 'illius' (see Buck, *Grammar*, 141). In early Latin we frequently meet genitives and datives like *illae* and *istae*, although datives such as *illo* and *isto* do not occur in the early period (see Luchs, Studemund's *Studien*, 1, 335, Sommer, *Handbuch*, 457, 459, 460). It seems likely, then, that primitive Italic had separate forms for the feminine (*-ās* and *-āi*).⁴

If our reconstruction of Italic forms is correct, Latin must have inherited the declension seen in the early genitive *illīs*, *illae* (for **illās*), *illīs*, and dative *illī*, *illae*, *illī*, and further-

³ Buck, *Grammar*, 145, and Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, 76 f., regard *pieis* and *piei* as modifications of *i*-stem forms **peis* and **pei* under the influence of the nominative *pis*. It is not clear how *pis* could exert such an influence, since neither *pis* nor **peis* could suggest an *i*-stem in Oscan. Ehrlich cites Cretan *ῥplivs* (for **ῥplvs*), accusative of *ῥpeīs*, as a parallel; but that form itself is in need of further elucidation. If *pis* really did induce *pieis* it must have done so on the model of the *io*-stems, which have nominatives in *-is* beside genitives in *-eis*. It would then be necessary to derive the dative *piei* from *pieis* on the model of other pronominal forms such as *eizeis*: *altrei*. The hypothesis stated in the text certainly has an advantage over this in point of simplicity.

⁴ If *illīs*, *illī*, etc., were originally *i*-stem forms, they must at first have been used for all genders; but until we have some evidence that that was really their origin, such a consideration cannot weigh against the evidence stated above. Skutsch, *Glotta*, 1, 305 ff., bases his theory that they come from *i*-stems partly on the fact that they are used as feminines in Latin. It would be more reasonable to urge against him the fact that the use of the forms in *-is*, *-ius* and *-ī* as feminines gains ground after the beginning of the literature, while it cannot be cited at all from the dialects.

more the genitive *quois*, the dative *quoi*, and the possessive adjective *quorū*. From these the other genitives and datives of the Latin pronouns can easily be derived, although one or another of them may very well be old.

The *o*-stem forms of the interrogative-relative pronoun had several points of similarity with the demonstrative *hic* (*quod*: *hōd-ce*, *quō(d)*: *hō(d)-ce*, *quōrum*: *hōrum*, *quēs* > *quīs*: *hēs* > *hīs*, *quōs*: *hōs*, *quae*: *hae-ce*). On the basis of these correspondences the dative **quorū* > **quōi* > *quoi* > *cui* gave rise to **hōrū-ce* > **hōi-ce* > *hoi-ce* > *huic*; but there is no evidence to show in which of the first three stages of its development the dative of the relative-interrogative induced a like form in the demonstrative. In a similar way, and probably at the same time, there was formed on the model of the genitive **quorū* > **quōis* > *quois* a genitive **hōrū(ce)* > **hōis(ce)* > *hois(ce)* > *huic(ce)*.

The genitive and dative of *is* are most easily traced to the analogy of *ille*, *iste*, *ullus*, etc., since they had the same endings in most of their forms.⁵ If we choose the genitive plural as representing all these similar forms, the analogy may be stated thus: *illorum*: (gen.) *illīs*: (dat.) *illī* = *eorum*: **ēis*: **ēi*. If we assume that the process took place at the time when the genitive and dative of the relative-interrogative pronoun were *quōis* and *quōi*, these forms would furnish some support for the new creations. At any rate their further development was parallel; just as **quōis* became *quōis* and **quōi* became *quōi*, so **ēis* became *ēis* and **ēi* became *ēi*, both of which occur in early Latin.⁶

⁵ Sommer, *Glotta*, v, 258, shows that this stem was dominated by *o*-stem pronouns from Italic times.

⁶ Kent is surely wrong (*TAPA*, XLIII, 49) in regarding the monosyllabic dative of *is* as a monophthong (*ē* > *i*). It is a diphthong of secondary origin like those in *quoi* > *cui*, *huic*, *deinde*, *ain*, etc. Similarly in the genitive of the fifth declension, the analogical introduction of the second declension ending gave *rēi*, which regularly became *rēi* > *rei*. In the dative of the fifth declension, on the other hand, the regular development was: *-ē(i)ai* > *-ēē* > *-ē*.

If one accepts Skutsch's derivation of *illīs* and *illī* from an *ī*-stem (see above, p. 101), one may derive *ēis* and *ēi* from a stem *ēi-* parallel with the stem *ei-* which is seen in *eum*, *eos*, etc. Italic **eieis*, **eiei* would regularly become **ēis*, **ēi*, and then *ēis*, *ēi*.

Since *s* disappeared before voiced consonants, *quois*, *huis*, *eis*, *illis*, etc., lost their final element in such phrases as *illī(s) modi* (see Lindsay, *Latin Language*, 431). *Quoiquoimodi*, *cuimodi*, etc. never acquired much vogue; but the resemblance of *illi*, *isti*, etc., to genitives of the second declension gave those forms wide use in colloquial Latin, and ultimately led to the formation of datives in *-ō* (*illo*, *isto*, etc.).

The genitive *quoius* cannot be separated from the nominative singular masculine of the possessive adjective. Wackernagel's assertion, *IF.* xxxi, 269, that nominatives become stereotyped only in compounds, in the cardinal numerals, and in words that become adverbs, is true enough in general; but it has no weight at all in a specific case if we can point to an analogy that might induce the change. The nominative singular masculine *quoius* was probably stereotyped as a genitive form under the influence of *quois* (*quois servos* : *quois ancilla* = *quoius servos* : *quoius ancilla*). No doubt the old genitives in *-us* from consonant stems (*Venerus*, etc.) contributed to the result.

Since there is no evidence for an adjectival use of *huius*, *eius*, *illius*, etc., it seems probable that they originated from *quoius* after the latter had come to be used as a genitive of *qui*. The analogical processes which induced the new forms may be represented thus :

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \textit{quoi} : \textit{quois} : \textit{quoius} : & = & \textit{hoi(ce)} : \textit{hois} : \textit{hoius} \\ \textit{"} & \textit{"} & \textit{"} & = & \textit{ei} : \textit{eis} : \textit{eius} \\ \textit{"} & \textit{"} & \textit{"} & = & \textit{illī} : \textit{illīs} : \textit{illius} \end{array}$$

It was noted above that in all probability the adjective pronouns originally had separate forms for the genitive and dative singular feminine. The possessive from the relative-interrogative stem, however, could be used of an antecedent of any gender; *mulier quoius servos* must have been as correct as *meus (mulieris) servos*.⁷ When the form *quoius* was stereotyped as a genitive of the pronoun, it still retained the power to represent a feminine antecedent; in other words it was a genitive feminine as well as a genitive masculine and neuter.

⁷ So *quia vox* of a woman's voice in Pl. *Rud.* 229 and 332.

No doubt the fact that the third declension genitives in *-us*, e.g. *Castorus*, *Venerus*, *nominus*, served for all three genders contributed to this result.

As the *-us* genitive spread through the pronominal declension it still retained its use as a feminine; and during the period when the new forms were used side by side with the old shorter forms, these too were used as feminines (e.g. *ei(u)s*, Ter. *And.* 799). The use of the genitive forms in all three genders led to a similar extension of the dative form of the masculine to the feminine.

The datives *quoiŕŕi*, *huiŕŕic*, and *eiŕŕi*, which are actually found in early Latin cannot be survivals of the forms from which *quoi*, *huic*, and *ei* developed; they must be reformations on the basis of the genitive *quoiŕŕius*, *huiŕŕius*, and *eiŕŕius*. The dative *ŕi* comes from the proportion, *istum* : *isto* : *isti* = *eum* : *eo* : *ŕi*.